

REMARKS

In response to Office Action mailed May 23, 2005, requesting an election of claims for examination purposes, Applicant elects the claims of Group II including Claims 10-21 with traverse as to Group III. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's characterization of as being drawn to a processing architecture, etc. Rather, Group III are merely the Beauregard form of Claims 16-18 of Group II. It is hard to imagine how this would constitute a separate invention requiring the filing of a divisional application. At least for the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 10-24 should all remain subject to examination.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: July 7, 2005 By: Thomas Coester
Thomas M. Coester
Reg. No. 39,637

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 7, 2005.

Susan M. Barrette
Susan M. Barrette Date